

GARY M. RESTAINO  
United States Attorney  
District of Arizona  
KEVIN M. RAPP  
Arizona State Bar No. 14249  
Email: kevin.rapp@usdoj.gov  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
Two Renaissance Square  
40 N. Central Ave., Suite 1800  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
Telephone: 602-514-7500  
Attorney for Plaintiff

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

United States of America,  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
vs.  
  
David Allen Harbour,  
  
Defendant.

CR-19-00898-PHX-DLR (DMF)  
  
**UNITED STATES' SECOND  
MOTION TO STRIKE  
DEFENDANT'S AMENDED  
OBJECTIONS TO THE PSR,  
[Doc. 770]**

**INTRODUCTION**

This Court should strike the Defendant's Amended Objections to the Presentence Report [Doc. 770] because Defendant has entirely disregarded both this Court's order—which limited his objections to 34 pages—and the Arizona local rules that govern pleadings. Rather than comply with the Court's order and submit a filing within the page limit, Defendant simply transferred his extraneous argument to the footnotes and added single-space font throughout the body of the pleading. Worse, Defendant has—yet again—included a 76-page exhibit that simply rehashes the exact same arguments already contained of the body of his overly-long pleading. Defendant's objections now total 110 pages (compared to his previous 144-page motion). The Court should strike his pleading and order him to comply with the Court's Order and the Local Rules.

**LAW AND ARGUMENT**

*First*, Defendant flatly ignored the Court's prior order, which struck his first 68-

1 page objection to the PSR [Doc. 739] because it was well outside the bounds of an  
2 acceptable page limit:

3       The Court, having held evidentiary hearings, and having witnessed the  
4 evidence presented at [sic] trial as well as having read the pretrial, trial and  
5 post-trial motions finds that Defendant has not shown good cause for such an  
6 extensive and lengthy objection. The Court is familiar with the facts and legal  
7 issues raised and a 68-page objection is not necessary to inform the Court,  
8 would not assist the Court, and would be a waste of judicial resources.  
Defendant can comfortably inform the Court of his objections in 34-pages,  
half the 68-pages requested, but double the 17-page limit.

9 *Id.*

10       *Second*, Defendant extended the content of his recent pleading by transferring entire  
11 sections of argument to single-spaced footnotes. Defendant's 34-page motion now includes  
12 fourteen footnotes, five of which (fn. 5–9, 12) are single spaced and occupy approximately  
13 half-a-page each. There are also an additional nine single-spaced footnotes that occupy  
14 four-to-five lines each. In total, four-and-a-half *pages* of Defendant's pleading are  
15 comprised of single-spaced footnotes, without which Defendants pleading would been  
16 several pages longer, far exceeding the 34-page limit.

17       Beyond his attempts to evade the page limit, Defendant's footnotes are composed  
18 almost entirely of inappropriate legal argument. *See Sony Music Ent. v. Vital Pharms., Inc.*,  
19 No. 21-22825-CIV, 2022 WL 4771858, at \*13 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 14, 2022) (“addressing legal  
20 arguments in footnotes is an incorrect method to present substantive arguments on the  
21 merits or otherwise request relief from the Court.”). Indeed, much of Defendant's  
22 substantive description of the Government's case is contained in the footnotes and his 76-  
23 page exhibit, rather than in the body of the pleading.

24       *Third*, in addition to the single-spaced footnotes, another six pages of the motion are  
25 comprised of single-spaced bullet points, designed solely to circumvent the page limit.  
26 When combined with several pages that are devoted almost entirely to footnotes,  
27 Defendant's motion sometimes contains a single sentence that carries on for *multiple*  
28 *pages*, making it difficult to follow and undermining even the most advanced reader's

1 comprehension.

2 *Fourth*, Defendant has once again attached as an exhibit a document which is not  
3 an exhibit but is instead 76-pages of additional argument. In many cases, the “exhibit”  
4 regurgitates the exact same arguments that Defendant already made in his motion.  
5 Defendant’s motion should be stricken for this reason alone.

6 *Fifth*, as is now typical for anything that Defendant’s files, the motion is replete with  
7 *ad hominem* attacks that are unduly strident and inappropriate. Starting with an  
8 introductory missive that aggressively attacks and accuses the PSR writer, the motion never  
9 relents. Multiple evidentiary hearings and a guilty verdict notwithstanding, Defendant  
10 repeatedly alleges that Government counsel engaged in misconduct and made other  
11 misrepresentations (i.e., “just another version of the fiction the government has been  
12 spinning since the outset of a prosecution that, as these objections are composed and  
13 submitted, hangs by no more than the thinnest of threads.”) Mot. at 3. But like many of his  
14 filings, once stripped of overblown hyperbole, personal attacks, and incorrect statements  
15 of law and fact, the motion is reduced to a confusing muddle that is masquerading as a  
16 legitimate objection to the PSR.

17 Defendant’s method of brief-writing, which ignores Court rules and seizes every  
18 opportunity to attack those who disagree with him, is a disservice to the entire defense bar.  
19 After seeking Court permission, Defendant disingenuously side-stepped this Court’s order  
20 by resorting to multiple pages of single-spaced arguments, half-page footnotes, and a 76-  
21 page “exhibit” that is really a compendium of factual arguments. For the fourth time (post-  
22 trial) this Court should strike Defendant’s motion.

23 Respectfully submitted this 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2023.

24  
25 GARY M. RESTAINO  
26 United States Attorney  
District of Arizona

27 s/Kevin M. Rapp  
28 KEVIN M. RAPP  
Assistant U.S. Attorney

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 7, 2023, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF system for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants who have entered their appearance as counsel of record.

s/Daniel Parke  
U.S. Attorney's Office